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Tale type ATU 63, The Fox Rids Himself of Fleas, although widely distributed in European oral tradition of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has rarely been identified in earlier written sources. The most recent revision of the international tale-type index (Uther 2004, 1:59) adequately summarizes the short tale’s content:

A fox (jackal) takes a bunch of wool (grass, moss, wood) in his mouth and backs slowly into the water. The fleas in his coat jump forward until all of them are on the wool. Then the fox lets go of the wool or dives under the water.

The index’s references to the tale type’s scholarly treatments list Uther’s encyclopedic entry (1987) and the tale’s oldest attested versions in Arabic literary works dating from the ninth century onwards (Marzolph 1992, 2: 30, no. 110). As for the tale type’s geographical distribution, the index refers to regional tale-type indexes for, and tale collections in, a fair variety of European languages ranging from Finnish, Estonian, and Latvian, via Danish, Scottish, Irish, French, Catalan, Frisian, Flemish, and German, to Hungarian, Slovene, Polish, and Russian. To this may currently be added oral versions in Galician (Noia Campos 2010, 45–6), and literary versions in Spanish (Fradejas Lebrero 2005–2006). References to other than European tradition include texts from Pakistan, India, Spanish-American tradition, and South Africa.
Considering the tale’s wide distribution all over Europe it comes as a surprise that according to the state of knowledge some thirty years ago, “the animal tale is rarely contained in older compilations of fables and has only occasionally been adopted” (Uther 1987, 485). As a result of the intense debate concerning the dependence of narrative tradition on oral or written sources that took place in the 1930s between Walter Anderson, partisan of the former theory, and Albert Wesselski, proponent of the latter (Kiefer 1947, 67–71), folk narrative theory today acknowledges that in persisting, oral tradition is in constant communication with written tradition (Fischer 2008). Since this theorem applies equally to a given tale’s geographical dissemination, one would presume (in addition to a hypothetically existing but historically rarely evidenced steady oral tradition) the existence of a comparatively rich and diversified written tradition that served to disseminate the tale all over Europe so that folklorists were able to record it from oral tradition in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

It is this hitherto unexplored historical dimension of tale type ATU 63 that I assess here. Employing the Internet as a virtual library of scanned resources, the effort of historical erudites perusing hundreds of ancient books on dusty library shelves is transformed into a seductively comfortable armchair occupation whose main methodological challenge lies in identifying the most promising keywords for searching relevant texts on the web. Fortunately, the present tale is short and its keywords are unambiguous, as they include “fox,” “fleas,” and “water.” In the following, the different wording in the tale’s various attestations will not be discussed. If details differ, they mainly concern the object the fox uses to get rid of the fleas. The gist of the tale always remains the same.

French folklorist Paul Sébillot (1906, 3: 17) identified the tale’s earliest occurrence in a European work in Gervase of Tilbury’s early-thirteenth-century Latin Otia imperialia (Recreation for an Emperor; 2002, 690–91). The French tale-type catalogue (Delarue 1957, 30–31) further mentions Eugène Rolland’s Faune populaire de la France (The Common Fauna of France; 1908, 140–41, nos. 102–3) that in turn references Julliani’s Proverbes divertissants (Entertaining Proverbs; 1659, 78–81) and de Cuinghamien’s La sauvegarde des abeilles (The Protection of Bees; 1771, 317).

The tale type’s encyclopedic entry (Uther 1987) additionally lists Swiss natural historian Conrad Gesnner’s sixteenth-century Latin Historia animalium (1551, 1: 957–58) and encyclopedist Johann Heinrich Zedler’s German “Great Comprehensive Universal Dictionary of All Sciences and Arts” (1747, 51: 1278), both of which potentially exerted a considerable influence on later tradition. The entry’s reference to tale no. 61 in Nathanael Chytraeus’s Hun-
dert Fabeln aus Esopo, first published in 1571, is, however, misleading. The fable given by Chytraeus corresponds to the recently introduced new tale type ATU 910L: *Do Not Drive the Insects Away* (Uther 2004, 1:536–37) whose content overlaps only insofar as a fox is infested by insects (Dicke and Grubmüller 1987, 221–22, no. 195). Further, the presently discussed tale of the fox and the fleas is not a fable featuring animals as metaphorical representatives of human beings, as the genre implies, but a factual observation, albeit an alleged one. Considering the latter feature, the compilers of the French tale-type catalogue even decided to question the story’s qualification as a “folk tale,” although it has repeatedly been recorded as such from French oral tradition (Delarue 1957, 30–31). As William Hansen (2019) demonstrates for tale type ATU 232D*: *A Crow Drops Pebbles into a Water Jug* (Uther 2004, 1:147), even an (alleged) factual observation might eventually become a fable. Tale type ATU 63 apparently never crossed this genre barrier. All of the available texts use the tale to demonstrate the fox’s cleverness as proof of animal intelligence.

Since Latin was the medieval language of science and learning, other Latin versions of the tale, probably even more influential than that by Gervase of Tilbury, exist. In the second half of the thirteenth century, the tale was quoted by the German Dominican polymath Albertus Magnus. In his *De Animalibus* (On Animals), the author presents the tale on the authority of the obscure medieval author known as Jorach or Jorath, thus possibly implying an (as yet unidentified) intermediary between Gervase of Tilbury and himself (1651, 609; 1999, 2:1541). No fourteenth- and fifteenth-century sources containing the tale have so far been identified. The tale resurfaces in the sixteenth century, from now on enjoying an ever-increasing popularity. Swedish historian and naturalist Olaus Magnus in his *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus* (A History of the Northern People; 1998, 922) and Swiss physician and naturalist Conrad Gesner in his *Historia animalium* (1551, 957–58) still quote the tale as a factual event in learned Latin, while works by Spanish authors of the *siglo de oro* Feliciano de Silva (1534), Fray Luis de Granada (1583), and Diego Gutiérrez de Salinas (1600) range among the first to adapt the tale to a European vernacular (Fradejas Lebrero 2005–2006; López Gutiérrez 2012, 195). In French, the tale has an early attestation in a passage discussing the fox’s wisdom (*sagesse*) in Huguenot potter, scientist, and philosopher Bernard Palissy’s work offering the “Veritable Instruction by Which All Frenchmen Can Learn How to Multiply and Increase Their Wealth” (1563, fol. M verso). The German edition of French painter and architect Joseph Boillot’s book on portraits and emblematic images suitable for adorning buildings quotes the tale in the chapter on the fox (1604), although it is not contained in the original French edition dating from 1592.
At the end of the sixteenth century, the tale finds a powerful medium for its wide dissemination in Protestant preacher Johann Coler’s German *Oeconomia* (1596, 3: ch. 42), an early manual for managing the household (*Hausbuch*) that until the end of the seventeenth century experienced at least sixteen editions (Hahn 2013). Coler presents the tale, albeit somewhat ironically, in the book’s chapter on fleas as an instructive model for “lazy women and maidens” to easily get rid of the vermin. Copying Coler’s final remark almost verbatim, albeit omitting the adjective “lazy,” at the end of the seventeenth century the tale is included in the anonymous satirical compilation *Des galanten Frauenzimmers Curieuse Flöh-Jagt* (The Gallant Dame’s Curious Flea-Hunt 1691, 151). In seventeenth-century scientific literature in Latin, the tale is quoted on the authority of Albertus Magnus and Olaus Magnus in Italian physician and naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi’s *De animalibus insectis* (On Insects; 1602, 567) and, again on the authority of Albertus Magnus, in Polish polymath Jan (John, Johannes) Jonston’s *Historia naturalis* (1657, 92). In his treatise on “the Nature of Man’s Soule,” English courtier, diplomat, and natural philosopher Sir Kenelm Digby referred to the tale as an apt example for the “invention” and “cunning” of animals, particularly the “subtilities of the fox” (1645, 377).

The eighteenth century witnessed the tale’s proliferation in a fair variety of works. In a literary context, the tale appears in a footnote to Jean-Louis Aubert’s *Fables* (1774, 10) and in the lengthy entry on the fox (*vulpes*) in the anonymous German *Lexicon Phaedrianum* (1784, 281), a dictionary of words in the Latin fables attributed to the ancient author Phaedrus. Compilations of an instructive (and sometimes entertaining) nature include Hilarius Salustius’s booklet of entertaining tales (1717, 289), manuals of the “Hausbuch” type by Wolf Helmhhardt von Hohberg (1716, 2: 738) and Georg Heinrich Zincke (1764, 831), the latter first published in 1731, Johann Daniel Meyer’s reflections on curious beliefs regarding animals (1748, 28), and Justus Christian Hennings’s book on the visionary capacities of animals (1783, 341). Predominantly scientific discussions are those by Pierre Joseph Du Bois (1754, 3:298) and Swedish historian Erik Pontoppidan (1754, 43). In the context of natural history the tale is quoted in Zedler’s *Universal-Lexicon* (1747, 51:1278), Jacques-Christophe Valmont de Bomare’s “universal dictionary” (1776, 503), Pierre-Joseph Buc’hoz’s veterinary dictionary (1775, 301), Krzysztof Kluk’s Polish book on domestic and wild animals (1779, 1:363), Stanislaw Ładowski’s Polish *Historya naturalna* (1783, 94), Johann August Ephraim’s Goeze’s *Europäische Fauna* (1791, 191), and Carl Philipp Funke’s *Naturgeschichte und Technologie* (Natural History and Technology; 1794, 1:108). Although several of the aforementioned publications
were published in a number of editions, their potential impact on subsequent oral tradition pales by comparison to that of Georg Christian Raff’s *Naturgeschichte für Kinder* (A Natural History for Children; 1778, 449). Raff’s book is a tremendously appealing and commercially successful account of natural history in the form of a dialogue between a father and his children. In addition to publication in more than a dozen Geman editions until the mid-nineteenth century (Oelkers 2008), it was also translated and adapted into a variety of European languages, including Dutch (1781, 3:123), French (1786, 2: 310), Danish (1791, 450–51), English (1796, 2:223), and Hungarian (1846, 321–22), the latter first published in 1799.

In the nineteenth century, the tale continued to be quoted in accounts of natural history such as those by Georg Heinrich Christian Lippold (1801, 918), Heinrich Rudolf Schinz (1827, 135), H. Reichert (1837, 79), Samuel Schilling (1837, 121), and Lorenz Oken (1838, 1553). In addition, it was published in books for children and young adults (Campens 1869, 39; Glückselig 1843, 62; Pujoulx 1802, 94; Wackernagel 1866, 13; Weiss 1874, 257) as well as manuals for hunters (Blaze 1838, 412–23; Riesenthal 1882, 180; Ziegler 1848, 153; see also Maxwell 1833, 205), the earliest one probably being Jean Baptiste Jacques Le Verrier (Leverrier) de la Conterie’s manual on hunting with hounds (1845, 314), originally published in 1763. At the end of the century, the Swiss satirical journal *Nebelspalter* (1889, issue 15.26) supplied the tale’s short text with a depiction of its various stages on a large two-page illustration. And, finally, the German standard reference work on the life of animals, Alfred Edmund Brehm’s *Thierleben* (The Life of Animals 1894, 429), also mentioned the tale.

Having been recorded from oral tradition several times, the tale gained attention in folk narrative studies in the twentieth century. While neither Antti Aarne’s first tale-type index (1910) nor its enlarged English translation by Stith Thompson (1928) lists it, Thompson ennobled the tale by including it in his second revision (1961), following the tale type’s introduction in the Russian (Andrejev 1929, 18) and Polish tale-type catalogues (Krzyżanowski 1962, 1:56), the latter first published in 1947.

The condensed survey of the tale’s occurrence in historical sources credibly suggests that the tale’s existence in European oral tradition of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is not coincidental. The question is not so much whether or not written sources fed the tale into oral tradition or how the tale was potentially retold in oral tradition, but rather how, given the tale’s tremendously wide distribution in entertaining, instructive, and scientific literature for many centuries, it could possibly not have been retold in and recorded from oral tradition. At the beginning of the twenty-first century,
the tale is ubiquitous, as numerous texts in a variety of languages on websites and in blogs present and discuss the tale, most often without being aware of its impressive historical dimensions. A representative example was posted August 3, 2012, in the blog “Rock Eddy Bluff Farm: A Country Hideaway in the Ozark Hills.” The writer tells how one hot summer day, the “no-nonsense” country veterinarian from Vienna, Illinois, narrated the tale on the authority of “a fella who once told” it to him. The object the fox here uses to get rid of the fleas is a corncob.

A discussion of the tale’s implications in terms of genre must begin with its earliest documented attestation in ninth-century Arabic literature. In his Kitāb al-Hayawān (Book of Animals), Arab polymath al-Jāḥīz (d. 868) recounts the events from “popular tradition” (ḥadīth al-ʿāmma; 1969, 6: 306). In al-Jāḥīz’s version, the fox takes a piece or bundle of wool into its mouth. Being a critical observer, al-Jāḥīz adds a commentary saying, “If this was true, then it would truly be amazing. And if it was not true, then they [i.e., the people] would have attributed it to him [i.e., the fox] only because of the [fox’s demonstrated] excellence in cunning and cleverness.” Thus, with the impartial attitude typical for medieval Muslim authors, al-Jāḥīz leaves the tale’s veracity open to discussion, since, after all, God’s omnipotence can make anything happen, however unlikely it may or may not appear to the rational mind. Even so, al-Jāḥīz demonstrates a certain critical distance, as he attributes the tale to “popular,” i.e., uncritical and most probably oral tradition. Whereas the same remark referring to “popular tradition” introduces the tale in al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī’s (d. 1108) Muḥāḍarāt al-udabāʾ (Conversations of the Educated; 4: 680), the subsequent presentations in al-Nuwayrí’s (d. 1332) Nihāyat al-arab fī funūn al-adab (The Ultimate Ambition in the Arts of Erudition; 1933, 9: 279), al-Damārī’s (d. 1405) zoographical lexicon Hayāt al-ḥayawān (The Life of Animals n.d., 1: 175), and al-Ibshīḥī’s fifteenth-century encyclopedia al-Mustāraf fī kull fann mustazraf (The Exquisite Elements from Every Art Considered Elegant; 1983, 2: 229), widely read until the present day, classify the narrated events as belonging to the most elegant (ẓarīf) or the most subtle (laṭīf) actions attributed to the fox. And even this modest emphasis on the fox’s clever action is lost in other citations, such as those in al-Zamakhsharī’s ’s (d. 1144) compilation Rabīʿ al-abrār (Spring of the Pious; 1982, 4: 421) or al-Ḥanafī’s seventeenth-century Nuzhat al-udabāʾ (Entertainment of the Educated; n.d., 113b). Whereas the tale was originally presented as a somewhat dubious factual report rooted in popular tradition, the Arabic authors’ critical distance gradually diminished over time by reducing the fox’s action to a mere curiosity and, finally, to an unquestioned fact.
In European tradition from the thirteenth century onwards, the tale is predominantly presented similarly as a factual event, i.e., without giving the audience a clue to whether the author would have believed it as true or not. A modest notion of critique becomes only visible in the latter half of the eighteenth century when French author Le Verrier de la Conterie stated, “ceci n’est point une fable,” “this is by no means a fable” (1845, 314). Rather than implying the literary genre of the fable from Aesopic tradition, the author used the term “fable” as denoting a tale devoid of truth. At any rate, the author’s defensive commentary leads one to assume that he might have been faced with or probably was afraid to be faced with charges of telling a fictional tale. Substantiating this assumption, short commentaries contesting the tale’s truth appear with an increasing frequency from the end of the eighteenth century onwards. Goeze (1791, 191) thinks the story to be fictitious, although “hunters claim it to be true” and, “according to Pontoppidan, the Norwegian peasants assert the tale’s truth.” Funke, who originally presented the tale without a commentary, added a critical remark a few years later (1800, 17) to the effect that the fox’s artifice to get rid of fleas is probably only a hunters’ tall tale (Jäger-Sage). Addressing a juvenile audience, Pujoulx suggests that natural historians might have chosen more suitable examples to demonstrate the fox’s cunning, but even so he cites this story “that people in regions where foxes abound consider as true” (1802, 94). Lippold (1801, 918), who wrote his book specifically for “uneducated people and educated women,” equally suggests the story to be untrue and reasons, “which fox would ever have let a human being watch him so closely when acting that way?” Schinz (1827, 135) again thinks the tale to be a “fable,” and Diezel (1830, 699) argues that “the manipulations attributed to the fox … are ridiculous in the eyes of anybody who had the opportunity to observe the fox in his natural habitat.” Similar evaluations are given by Reichert (1837, 79) and Schilling (1837, 121). Quoting the tale from Le Verrier de la Conterie, Blaze adds a detailed critical commentary (1838, 412–13). Introducing the tale with the remark that people generally attribute more refinement (finesse) to the fox than the animal actually possesses, Blaze then acknowledges that the tale has been told as fact for quite some time. Referring to the tale’s attestation in Arabic author al-Damīrī’s late fourteenth-century encyclopedia, Blaze proceeds to mention that he himself killed foxes infested with innumerable fleas, inducing his satirical comment that these foxes probably never read the instructions for getting rid of fleas properly. He concludes by saying that people rather tend to believe the most improbable facts than question whether they are true or not: “Human beings, in general, love the marvelous.” Oken (1838, 1553) qualifies the tale as Mährchen and light-hearted joke (Spaß). Glückselig (1843, 62)
concedes that the tale makes sense and certainly honors the fox’s astuteness, were it not for the fault of not being true. Ziegler (1848, 153) finds the tale charming but regrets that those who could confirm its veracity are not alive any more. At the end of the twentieth century, Joan A. Chadwick (1994, 71–72) summarizes the critique in a matter-of-fact statement. “The truth of this story is somewhat in question as a fox’s coat is known to be quite waterproof, and the parasites may be able to survive in the fur for a much longer period than this procedure would entail.” Even so, the author concedes that the tale “has withstood the test of time” as it “illustrates a continuing human belief in the fox’s ingenuity.”

From its early documented stages in medieval Arabic literature, the short tale of the fox getting rid of the fleas thus traversed various stages of critical doubt concerning popular tradition and uncritical certainty in natural history. Hunters, with their professional expertise, added to the ambiguity by either casting doubts on the tale’s truth or explicitly confirming the fox’s action as having witnessed it themselves. Substantial doubts concerning the tale’s credibility have been voiced in European tradition for more than two centuries. Even so, at the beginning of the twenty-first century the tale appears to have returned to the earliest stages of its history as documented more than a millennium ago, i.e., to uncritical popular tradition. Somehow, it is simply too fascinating not to be believed, and too attractive not to be told.
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